

| | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/760,431 | SIMONUTTI ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | EDMUND H. LEE | 1732 |

All Participants:

(1) EDMUND H. LEE.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) MR. CHESTNUT.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 February 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

THOSE OUTSTANDING IN THE CASE

Claims discussed:

THOSE PENDING IN THE CASE

Prior art documents discussed:

THOSE CITED AS PRIOR ART OF RECORD

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
DISCUSSED THE CANCELLATION OF INTERFERING CLAIMS 16-19 IN ORDER TO PLACE THE CASE IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. EXAMINER LEE INFORMED MR. CHESTNUT THAT AN INTERFERENCE CANNOT BE DECLARED SINCE CLAIMS 1-12 ARE NON-INTERFERING. MR. CHESTNUT AGREED TO CANCEL INTERFERING CLAIMS 16-19 IN FAVOR OF ALLOWING NON-INTERFERING CLAIMS 1-12. ALSO, MR. CHESTNUT INDICATED THAT A CONTINUATION WILL BE FILED IN ORDER TO PURSUE INTERFERING CLAIMS 16-19. .